

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8-9, and 11-12 are now pending in the application. Claims 6, 7 and 10 have been cancelled and Claims 8 and 11 have been amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REQUEST FOR CONSIDERATION OF IDS REFERENCES

It has come to our attention that the IDS Form 1449 filed on April 11, 2001 with the Application was not initialed by the Examiner indicating that the reference has been considered. We have enclosed a copy of the Form 1449 for your convenience.

We would appreciate your initialing the IDS form 1449 and returning the same to us at your earliest opportunity so that we may pay the Issue Fee.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Applicants are submitting a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement along with a copy of the International Search Report, attached hereto.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6-7, 8 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto (U.S. Pat. No. 6,476,855) in view of Sasaki et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,729,216). Claims 10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto and Sasaki et al. as applied to Claim 6 and 8 and

further in view of Mazzilli (U.S. Pat. No. 6,333,759). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 8

None of the references suggest the feature of the claimed invention that a camera is mounted on the vehicle at a non-movable part of its door mirror, its window visor or its door knob mounting part. Accordingly, claim 8, as amended is believed to be allowable over the references.

Claim 9

Fig. 5 of Yamamoto merely shows the cameras 101, 201 mounted at the side of the headlight. As shown in Fig. 6 of Yamamoto, the headlight irradiates light in the forward direction (A) other than the range to be captured by the cameras 101, 201 (B, C). Accordingly, the headlight of Yamamoto does not correspond to the illumination means of the claimed invention for irradiating light to the range to be captured by the camera. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 distinguishes over Yamamoto.

Claim 12

None of the references suggest the element of the claimed invention that the openable member is disposed at the front in the capturing direction of the camera. Accordingly, claim 12 is also believed to be allowable over the references.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant(s) have amended Claim 11 to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, Claim 11 should now be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 30, 2004

By: Greg Stobbs
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS/kk